

# The Christian

No. 290

# News-Letter

Edited by  
KATHLEEN  
BLISS

23rd July, 1947

AT A TIME when almost all the news of foreign affairs in the newspapers is of political tension and economic shortage, the news that a political situation which only a few weeks ago seemed to hold the possibilities of bloodshed on a large scale has yielded to high statesmanship is almost unbelievably good. Only those who understood nothing of the difficulties can regard the transfer of power from Great Britain to the two new dominions of India and Pakistan as a small and easy achievement. The acute shortage of newsprint and a praiseworthy distaste for blowing our own trumpet have prevented lavish self-commendation in the British press. No warmer tributes, however, could be paid than some which come from discerning Americans, and they will be appreciated here in Britain where the impression has been growing that Britain was cast for the rôle of scapegoat in the uneasy drama of post-war international politics. Thus Mr. Walter Lippmann, writing in the *New York Herald Tribune* on June 7th, 1947, says: "The Prime Minister, Mr. Attlee, and the Viceroy, Lord Mountbatten, have done a service to all mankind by showing what statesmen can do, not with force or with money, but with lucidity, reason, imagination, resolution, sincerity and good will. The world needed desperately a demonstration of this kind to renew

## NEWS-LETTER

THE FUTURE IN INDIA

## SUPPLEMENT

THE CHURCH IN GREECE

By

EDWARD EVERY

men's faith in the power of the human spirit. . . . This performance is not the work of a decadent people. This, on the contrary, is a work of political genius requiring the ripest wisdom and the freshest vigor, and it is done with an elegance and a style that will compel and will receive an instinctive respect throughout the civilized world."

## THE FUTURE IN INDIA

When Mr. Attlee moved the second reading of the Indian Independence Bill in the House of Commons, he struck a welcome note in emphasizing the opportunities of the future equally with the achievements of the past. Recent events have naturally served to concentrate attention on the *political* relations between Great Britain and India, but these have never been the only or even the chief relationship between the two peoples. Mr. Attlee said: "There has been a multitude of administrators, soldiers, and missionaries who have served India with great devotion and have loved the Indian people. In every part of India are the graves of those who died in her service," and he went on to stress the importance of the work of those British subjects who, in different capacities, will continue to work in India. This is therefore a moment for thinking about the future, and for trying to see, not so much how this or that separate enterprise can be carried on under new political conditions, as what is the broad picture which the future presents. In every sphere—administration, industry, commerce and voluntary service—relationships, official and personal, between British people and Indians, have been changing as national feeling among Indians has grown, and they will change still more when the conscious and unconscious assumption of superiority on the one side and of inferiority and resentment on the other, inevitable while one was ruler and the other ruled, no longer has any basis in fact. How these changes will work themselves out is unpredictable, and we do not propose to enter into speculation. What we propose to do in this News-Letter is to turn our attention away from the political aspects of the Indian situation to examine two other forces at work in India.

India has been one of the great fields of Christian service. Thousands of men and women, Catholic and Protestant, from all parts of Europe, from the United States and from the Dominions have given their lives to the service of the Indian people and the building up of the Indian Church. Millions of Christians have supported this work by their money and their prayers. Had Great Britain and India severed their connection in bloodshed, it is highly probable that much of what is at present done by missions in India would have been swept away. The destruction of schools, colleges and hospitals, the confiscation of property, the banishment of foreign personnel—all these might have taken place, but they have not. God in His mercy has allowed missionary work in India to survive both war and political change, not without hardship, but without destruction, and along with thankfulness comes the self-questioning, "For what purpose was it spared, and to what end ought its resources to be directed?" The gradual devolution of control from foreign missionary bodies to the indigenous Church has been going ahead with varying degrees of speed in different parts of India for some years. How it will continue is one of the main interior problems of the relationship between missionary bodies and Indian Churches to which all missionary societies are giving close and constant attention.

### **THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION IN INDIA**

But it is possible to ask the question we have just suggested within the sphere of the Church without relating it sufficiently to other realities in India. Of all the changes brought into India by the impact of the West none is greater or likely to be more lasting than the letting loose upon a vast and primitive agricultural society of all the forces of the industrial revolution. The monster which has taken years of taming in our own country has been let loose in India. Some, though few, of the miseries which accompanied the industrial revolution here have been foreseen and prevented in India, but much of the story is being repeated. There is no hope of raising the standard of living of Indian people without a full development of her raw materials by all the



methods of modern science, technology and industrial development. How to achieve this end for the good of the Indian people as a whole and not for the profit of the few, and without sacrificing in the process the lives and happiness of many thousands, together with much that was good in Indian village life, is one of the great social and religious problems confronting India to-day. Only through the mouths of isolated individuals did the voice of Christianity raise a protest against child labour, the work of women in the mines, the appalling housing conditions in England a hundred or more years ago. Indeed one of the conspicuous failures of the Church in this country has been its relationship to modern industry. Is the same thing to happen in India? Are we to conclude from the fact that the main growth of the Church has been among those populations which have been least affected by modern industrial development that the Church in India has so far comparatively slender links with the industrial communities of the cities, except as industrial workers come from, and return to, the villages? Yet it is more than likely that from the industrial towns rather than from agricultural India new and inflammatory forces will come and will shape India's future society.

Industrial India provides just the sort of conditions for the growth of new creeds, and none are more aware of this than the Communists. It is difficult to believe that Hinduism as a faith, bound as it is to the caste system and rooted in the life of the villages and the large family system, will become a vitalizing faith in the life of industrial communities. What sort of ideals and patterns of life and behaviour and forms of aspiration will mould these new and growingly powerful industrial communities in India is an open question. But the answer is not one which will concern India alone: it will have a profound effect in the new Asia which will grow up.

#### **THE EFFECT OF THE WAR ON INDUSTRIAL INDIA**

The speed of industrial development in India has, of course, been greatly accelerated by the war. The help given

us by friends who have unique opportunities for assessing these changes, enables us to give the following account of the situation though necessarily only in outline. The proportion of India's population at present engaged in industry is small—less than 10 per cent. But this is an industrial force equal to that of Great Britain. India is capable of industrial greatness. She has the raw materials, including in South and Central Bihar the best iron ore in the world. She has hydro-electric plants which are among the finest in the world. At Jamshedpur the Tata Iron and Steel Company has the largest steel plant in the British Empire, far more up to date than anything at home, producing a good mild steel. A few firms have also the most modern mass production methods, and up-to-date Western machinery. The Bata Shoe Company, whose original home was Czechoslovakia, has developed the mass production of shoes in India and made it a very big and efficient industry. At the opposite end of the scale are many small and inefficient industries, relying for profit solely on the cheapness of labour.

Much is said of the inefficiency of Indian labour. In textiles, for example, a thousand spindles employ in the United Kingdom 10 operatives, in the United States 13, in Japan 26 and in India 43. In mining no country has so low an output per head as India, in spite of the fact that the mines are shallow and dry, and seams are 12 to 20 feet thick.

The reasons for poor output are not far to seek: the average Indian worker weighs seven stones; his standard of living is too low for strenuous work; inadequate food, malaria and hookworm constantly lower his efficiency. The climate discourages physical effort. He is at heart an agricultural labourer doing a distasteful job, and the former excessive hours (thirteen to fifteen a day) made slow movement necessary and ingrained a habit of dilatoriness which has not been eradicated. Most factories employ 10 per cent extra labour to allow for time-wasting and absenteeism, some even 25 per cent. The expectation of life which in New Zealand is 65 years for males and 68 for females is in what was British India 27 and 26.5 respectively.

The over-all picture of Indian labour therefore shows that at least three people are employed in industry in India for every one in the United Kingdom to obtain roughly the same result in goods. The inefficiency of labour has always been argued as a reason for very low wages, and thus a vicious circle has been set up, for much inefficiency is due to the cheapness of labour and all its results on physique and capacity.

Much has been done to improve conditions in factories. The Factory Acts are good and there is a keen inspectorate which with more adequate training and selection could be developed into a really good force.

The worst human problem, however, lies not within the factory but around it, for this great mass of people used to achieve these results have to live somewhere. In 1931 81 per cent of the dwellings of Bombay were one-roomed and the *average* number of people living in one room was four. Over 250 thousand people live in rooms occupied by one to nine persons, and 80 thousand people in rooms occupied by 10 to 19 persons; 50 thousand rooms were occupied by 20 or more people. How do 20 persons live in one small room about 12 feet square? They do not. They pay rent for a place to put down a little tin box which contains all their worldly goods. They cook, eat and sleep in the streets. One observer, looking at a wretched tenement of single room dwellings, four stories high, remarked that such a slum must be about due for demolition, and received the reply, "Demolition! Why, this was only built two years ago". Wherever a factory is erected, poverty-stricken people seeking work flock in and overnight there springs up a colony of huts, made of kerosene tins and gunny bags, without water, light and sanitation, and without the air and space which mitigate the rigours of life in even the worst villages.

Such conditions as these provide fine soil for great discontent. Gradually the standard will rise. Technical education will increase. Mechanization will compensate for



effect of climate on physical effort. When the standard begins to rise discontents will be more loudly expressed.

### TRADE UNIONS IN INDIA

One of the chief effects of the war has been on the trade union movement in India. Only 15 per cent of Indian employees are trade union members. The movement dates back only to 1918, but the 1926 Trade Union Act gave to Indian trade unions rights similar to those in the United Kingdom. Meetings are attended by non-members who in fact outnumber members, and non-members are accepted and band together for strike action. They are seriously cramped for funds. Labour is largely migratory and few employees are sufficiently educated to take a lively interest. The leadership of the trade unions is largely in the hands of educated people, drawn particularly from the surplus of lawyers which India possesses : there is very little leadership coming up from below.

The more acute trade union leaders see that there is a race on between the establishment of democratic trade union practices and the influence of Communists in the factories, which is very considerable. Communist policy in India is to lay hold on likely young people coming from the universities and send them into the factories to work for four or five years and to learn all they can of the processes and organization of an industry from top to bottom. Even employers say that many of these young Communists are hardworking, polite, pleasant to deal with. They are well organized and are expected to make, and in fact do make, large sacrifices for the cause they believe in. Their closest allies are those employers and directors of companies, British and Indian, who are not interested in the welfare of the ordinary Indian workman, and who look to making the largest profits in the shortest time and to rigging the financial market rather than establishing a reputation for quality in their goods. In sharp contrast to these stand the small number of employers, mostly large firms which have set themselves to train an efficient labour force, to grapple with housing by building (often at very heavy cost) their own

estates and by interpreting and enforcing the many good Acts for the protection of workers in a generous spirit.

The future holds many opportunities and possibilities of good. Competent managers and skilled technicians and administrators, if they have that simple good will and power of leadership, to which Indian people respond so readily, can, as Mr. Attlee remarked, do as much as Government itself to cement the bonds between the two new Dominions and the rest of the British Empire. The opportunities for missionary service are not a whit the less in changed political circumstances, though political independence serves to underline the need for highly qualified doctors, teachers and other experts prepared to forego the opportunities of promotion at home in order to train both in skills and in outlook a large force of Indians who alone can meet India's health and educational needs. At this turning-point in Indian affairs more joint consultation between Christians engaged in industry and commerce in India and missionary leaders regarding the task of the Church in relation to industry would be welcome.

#### THE SUPPLEMENT

The Rev. Edward Every has for many years taken the keenest interest in affairs of the Greek Orthodox Church. From 1932-35 he was at the theological college of the Patriarchate of Constantinople on the island of Halki in the Sea of Marmora. He returned to the Middle East in 1941 as an R.A.F. chaplain, with special contacts with the Greek forces. Last year he went to Greece for the Committee for Christian Reconstruction in Europe and travelled widely on a mission of investigation into the needs of the Greek Church in reconstruction. He accompanied the deputation sent by the World Council of Churches to the Greek Church. For the opinions expressed in his Supplement he is alone responsible.

Kathleen Bliss



## THE CHURCH IN GREECE—A NOTE

By EDWARD EVERY

IN February of this year the World Council of Churches sent a small delegation on a mission of friendship to visit the leaders of the Orthodox Churches in Greece, Turkey, Syria, Lebanon and Egypt. Everywhere its members were warmly welcomed and eagerly questioned about affairs in the Churches of the West. It is beyond all reasonable doubt that the Orthodox Churches of the Mediterranean area will send delegates to the special assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1948.

To Christians in this country, with the exception of the small handful of people who have made them an object of special study, the Eastern Orthodox Churches are *terra incognita*. The four hundred years since the Reformation divided the Christian West are short compared with the nine centuries during which Eastern and Western Christendom have been two separate worlds. In being Christian the Orthodox Churches are one with us, but their long history has produced a markedly different kind of church life and of thought forms.

Few would doubt that this history can help us very much. But to become interested in the Orthodox Churches as though they were merely historical relics is a travesty of the facts and an insult to the Orthodox Churches, which are *living* Churches.

### THE ORTHODOX CHURCH IN PRESENT-DAY GREECE

It is impossible in a single Supplement to say something about all the Orthodox Churches of the Near East. I confine myself to Greece because my chief experience since the war has been there.

One of the most striking differences in the life of the Greek Church and that of the Western Churches is the different meaning of the words "priest" and "laymen", and the relative position which they occupy in the Church. There are in Greece more laymen than clergy with degrees in theology. Moreover, most of the clergy—the village priests and many of the town parish priests—are ordained comparatively late in life, have never been through a seminary training or through the university, and are

not in fact what Western Europe regards as "clerks" at all; they are much less "clerical" than most of the lay theologians.

The priest in Greece, as distinct from the bishop and the layman, is primarily a celebrant of liturgical services and a dispenser of sacramental rites. Even as such, he is merely the bishop's local representative. He has no power to take initiative apart from his bishop. The bishop, in the provinces of Greece, has a diocese with the population rather larger than an English parish, from fifty to eighty thousand. There are seventy-four dioceses in Greece. The bishop and the diocesan preacher, and perhaps one or two others, are likely to be the only clergy with university education. Aided by any local laymen who have studied theology or are interested, the bishop and his personal assistants are the teaching clergy. They travel round so that each village should have a sermon three or four times a year. Otherwise, in the country, some parish priests read sermons by other people or more often there is no sermon at all. Any teaching of the children is done either by the schoolmaster or by a voluntary effort, authorized by the bishop, in which the priest may or may not take part.

### RELIGIOUS SOCIETIES

An outstanding feature in the life of the Greek Church are the religious societies or ethnic-religious unions. They have existed in the capital and in many provincial towns for a very long time and in various forms. Some in the north go back to Turkish times. Such societies care for the poor and sick, ran day-schools before the state took them over, and often possess halls in which lectures are given on a variety of different subjects. The length of the Orthodox Liturgy and the fact that priests are not so well read as lay schoolmasters lead to the practice of having a religious lecture or sermon, either in the church or in the lecturing hall, at an hour different from that of the Liturgy. Then the preacher may be a priest but is more often a layman with a theological degree. Being a layman in no way implies not being "clerical", in the sense of being the Church's servant. In some provincial towns in Greece the whole religious movement and all branches of religious societies are grouped under the roof of the bishop, where his personal staff of monastic clergy live with him.

Athens is in a rather different position. The city is overgrown. The Archbishops have tended to be absorbed in their relations with the state and the university affects the situation. Religious societies in Athens have tended to be created by striking personalities, and to spread to the provinces from Athens.

### THE ZÖE BROTHERHOOD

There is one unique society, named the "Zöe" (Life) brotherhood, which is about forty years old. It consists of men with theological degrees, who are celibates as long as they remain members of it and who give their whole time to its work, as preachers, teachers, writers, printers and in other ways. About one-third of the members are ordained priest-monks who may occupy ecclesiastical offices, but who must resign from the society if they accept bishoprics. The remaining two-thirds are lay-theologians who preach and teach, organize "catechetical schools" and write books. They have a community house. Although they wear lay dress and although they are in many ways independent of the control of the bishops, they are not really a "lay" movement. They are professional servants of the Church as much as the clergy although in a non-priestly capacity in most cases. Outside Athens, most of them are giving assistance to bishops who have asked for such help.

There is a whole-time sisterhood, working on a similar system, named "Evseveia" (Piety).

### CHRISTIAN SCIENTIFIC MEN

The most important lay societies formed in recent years are due to the initiatives taken by members of Zöe and by close friends of Zöe. They are still looking to Zöe for advice and spiritual direction and the priest-monks belonging to Zöe are their confessors and chaplains. But they are societies of people without theological degrees who earn their living in secular life. One of the most important is the Christian Union of Scientific Men, which was founded in 1938 and expanded greatly during the war.

It is largely concerned with *Apologetics*, that is to say, it has addressed itself to a particular situation existing in Greek intellectual circles where atheistic communism and materialism were trying to establish a hold. It has an organ called *Aktines*



(Rays of Light), in which it produced last year a declaration signed by 181 of the front rank scientists, doctors, historians, philosophers and artists in Greece. Not all the signatories were Christians, but all put their names to a declaration calling the people of Greece to re-establish the basic spiritual foundations of their civilization. "The laying of such foundations," said the declaration, "is impossible unless contemporary mankind makes use of the stock of values which Christendom, the Christian faith and Christian ethics, have to offer. Abandonment of those values is abandonment of all well-founded hope that mankind may be able to build a better future." The declaration asserted that "the attempt to make science appear to contradict the Christian faith has no scientific foundation" and called for a new obedience of individual men and women to the moral imperative of Christianity in the soul, without which social justice was unobtainable.

This declaration had a wholly different tone and temper from the materialist ethos of the pre-war Balkan universities, and it marked a change. It was followed in December last year by a book written by members of the Christian Union of Scientific Men in which they reprinted the declaration and delivered a popularly written and well pointed attack on so-called "scientific" objections to the Christian faith. In ten days 50,000 copies had been disposed of and a second edition was ordered.

## THE TEMPER OF MIND OF THE GREEK CHRISTIAN

In the religious societies, especially in those run by Zöe, but also in some of the others, we find a kind of lay person—not always a theologian although interested in theology—who has the attitude to Christianity which the Communist has to Communism. He is vehemently convinced that there is abundant hope for Greece if her leading men and intellectuals will *both lead and follow* the ordinary men in the fields and shops of the country who put their trust in God. There are tremendous numbers of people in Church, both where there are sermons and where there are no sermons, but only prayers. A very large number—not all uneducated by any means—regard the Greek victories in Albania in 1940, besides the defeat of ELAS in 1944-45, in the teeth of the odds, as divine miracles. Humanly

speaking, Greece should now be behind the "Iron Curtain"; only in some mysterious way has she escaped. The more "conscious" Christians who have found their way to personal faith, those, that is to say, who read the Bible, and go to confession and communion regularly, tend to take the view that the miracles have merely given Greece a short breathing-space.

The catechetical schools have been multiplied and their work intensified and everyone teaches in them if he can be qualified, so that the rising generation may include a strong body of people who have reached personal religion in childhood. The classes in the catechetical schools movement, consisting of pupils going to secondary schools and of young workers, seem to be full of children not from specially pious homes, but brought to the classes by other children, often against their parents' inclinations. There are very large classes—but there are also smaller "Christian pupils' teams" consisting of the keener pupils who meet on other occasions, and camp together in the summer.

What is taught in the catechetical schools is very definitely supernaturalism, sacramentalism and acceptance of the Orthodox tradition in essentials. It is not controversially denominational; there is no occasion for that in Greece where there is only one form of Christianity generally known. It is not exactly fundamentalist. I think that the Greeks, who do not read the Old Testament as we read it, have never forgotten the existence of allegorical meanings and oriental imagery in it; they are not meticulous over details. But archaeology is often said to have refuted the "Negation", where the Bible is concerned. There is a rather attractive simple belief that the Christians of the East, having kept their Christianity in a form entirely continuous with primitive Christianity, are the People of God. Thus Greek Christians face the uncertain future, armed for spiritual conflict.

#### **THE GREEK CHURCH AND ECUMENICAL RELATIONSHIPS**

Ninety-nine per cent of Greek Christians are Orthodox. The only Christian minorities are about 50,000 Roman Catholics mostly of foreign origin and living in very few localities, and 8,000–9,000 Protestants, also living in very few localities. There is also a small dissident movement among the Orthodox—Old Calendarism—but as it has all the doctrines and services of the Orthodox I count it inside the 99 per cent.

The result is that the division of Christendom is not visible to Greeks at home. Greeks abroad, if religious, tend to an even stronger attachment to their Church as their link with home. Greek theologians are very sure of their own confessional position, not without reason. All the Councils which they regard as ecumenical were in the past accepted by the whole West also. They have no credal formulæ, to which they have to subscribe, subsequent in date to those ancient councils. Therefore they feel that the only possible basis of union for Christendom is for Romanists and Protestants to become Orthodox in dogma returning to the eighth century, retaining their Western rites and customs in things not essential. They believe that the Eastern Orthodox Church (an international body including Greeks, Slavs, Rumanians, Syrians, etc.) is the one truly Catholic and truly Apostolic Church which alone maintains unbroken and complete continuity of doctrine, sacraments, and church life with the fathers and the apostles—and that all should be reunited to that trunk. But that does not mean that they regard the West as Rome regards the non-Roman part of Christendom. They have not entirely made up their mind what our real relation to the undivided Church of the past (and thus to them) now is. However, what they do feel is that reunion is in our interests rather than in theirs and that therefore it is for us to move towards them.

One must also say that "Old Calendarism" as a dissenting movement against minor changes, like that of the "Old Believers" in Russia, has the effect of a warning to the Greek Church that even an appearance of compromise between her and some Western Church, Roman or not, might split the Greek people with a religious controversy. Has any national Church the right to go to pieces for the sake of nominal unity with Churches in other countries?

My own opinion is that participation in the World Council of Churches will not mean much on the "Faith and Order" side. The only Churches which can easily reunite with the Orthodox are the Coptic, Armenian and Assyrian Churches in the East and, possibly, the Old Catholics. There is much sympathy with Orthodox in traditional Anglicanism, but the difficulties in the way of full reunion between the two Churches



are considerable. On the "Life and Work" side of the World Council's work, I am more sanguine. There is certainly great goodwill. But the Orthodox have a different attitude to social and political questions from that characteristic of Anglo-American religion.

The Orthodox Church was represented at Stockholm, Lausanne, Oxford and Edinburgh. Indeed it was the Patriarchate of Constantinople in 1920 which first proposed the formation of a "League (or Fellowship) of Churches" (Koenonia tōn Ekklesiōn). The Patriarchates of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem, the Church of Cyprus and the Church of Greece, i.e. the Greek-speaking Churches and the Arabic-speaking Church of Syria and Lebanon, may participate in the General Assembly of the World Council of Churches, without having made any striking new departure. But the Orthodox come to conferences primarily to state their own point of view not in order to prepare for participation in any sphere of "Reunion all round". They are interested in the abolition of proselytism, in the regulation of the questions concerning mixed marriages, in the exchange of books, students, visiting professors and material facilities between theological faculties, in inter-church courtesies, inter-church aid, and "official-recognized friendship" between the Orthodox Church and those other Christian bodies who do not proselytize Orthodox people. They want the Christian Churches to be friendly to one another and to aid one another where that is possible without any sacrifice of doctrinal principles.

With the Armenians, Copts, Old Catholics, and Anglicans closer relations may be contemplated, but always on the assumption that these bodies are on their way back to the Orthodoxy of the first eight centuries. This does not mean that, in the modern Orthodox view, we ought to return to the early Middle Ages and live and think as men did then. It means that certain doctrines or dogmas, once believed by all Christians, should again be believed by all Christians. The Churches of various regions should agree, as the Orthodox Churches agree, in having one list of beliefs necessary to salvation, or rather one integrated body of belief, one proclamation of the Gospel. Nothing should be added to the Creed or otherwise made a "necessary" doctrine

of faith without common consent, but nothing which common consent has regarded as "necessary" should be made "dubious" or put on one side. Rome is said to have introduced new dogmas, declaring them necessary; Protestantism is said to have set aside what the whole Church thought to be needful. Rome denied the churchmanship of Eastern Christians; Geneva denied the reality of the Church of the past and of the visible Catholic Church. True unity of faith with the East can come only when these denials have been withdrawn, in the Eastern view.

It is often said that, on the other hand, the Eastern Church denied the principle of the Church's freedom from state control. The Eastern Orthodox Churches are all national Churches; even when they are not state Churches, they have certain strong links with the governments of the nations to which their members belong. It is not a question of social inactivity. The Greek Church has an extensive social work for the poor, the orphans and the sick. There seems to be a very strong connection between Church life and the social, family-like equalitarianism of Balkan peasant peoples; in the Church, the nation is one community. There is also a real popular respect for human personality. But the civil government is not regarded as something to which ecclesiastics should dictate; it, on the contrary, often dictates to ecclesiastics, who are anxious to be on good terms with their governments. The historical explanation of this can be found partly in the absence of a sharp line between the clergy and the laity. The nation is, or has been, the Church. If the bishops, under pressure, say undignified things, no one confuses the bishops' personal political opinions with the religious teaching of the Church. Many Easterns would say that it is a worse sacrifice of the Church's spiritual freedom for Western Churches to become political forces, and deliberately identify themselves with political points of view, than it is for rulers of Eastern Churches to co-operate with the ruling civil powers for the time being, in order that the Church may exist.

---

**Subscriptions**—12s. 6d. (\$3.00 in U.S.A. and Canada) for one year. 6s. 6d. for six months (Great Britain and Ireland only). Single copies, 6d.; reduction for quantities.

**Bound Volumes**—Vols. II—XI (May 1940—Dec. 1946) 8s. 6d. each post free, or 7s. 6d. each in sets of four or more consecutive volumes.

*All communications and subscriptions should be sent to—*  
**THE CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER, 20 BALCOMBE STREET, DORSET SQUARE, LONDON, N.W. 1.**

---

Published by Dr. J. H. Oldham for the Christian Frontier Council, and printed in Great Britain by the Church Army Press, Cowley, Oxford.